

JAN 23 2004

CLAIM HISTORY (CLAIM 41)

ACTION DATE		CLAIM	ACTION
Original Claim 41 Presented in Preliminary Amendment dated 10/17/00	41. emergency response vehicle, said vehicle comprising: a triangular wheel base; at least one emergency response fluid delivery tank; and an engine.	Original Claim Presented	
Office Action dated 7/17/02. Paper Number: (not listed)		Rejected § 103(a), Veath Sr.	
Response dated 11/25/02	41. A fire-fighting emergency response vehicle, said vehicle comprising: a triangular wheel base; at least one emergency response fluid delivery tank; and an engine	Claim Amended	
Office Action dated 01/03/03, Paper Number: (not listed)		Rejected § 103(a), Schaffler and Bower	
Response dated 03/20/03	41. A fire-fighting emergency response vehicle, said vehicle comprising: a triangular wheel base comprising a single front wheel and two opposing rear wheels; a driver's seat and drivers compartment; at least one emergency response fluid delivery tank; and a vehicle engine.	Claim Amended	
Office Action dated 04/04/03, Paper Number: 22		Rejected § 103(a), Pestonik and Carrier	

RECEIVED

JAN 27 2004

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

# CLAIM HISTORY (CLAIMS 48 and 60)

Claim 48 initially presented in Preliminary Amendment dated 10/17/2000	48. The vehicle of claim 41 wherein said front wheel comprises a 360 degree rotatability about an axis substantially orthogonal to the axis of rotation of said front wheel for translational movement of said vehicle.	Original Claim <b>Presented</b>
Office Action dated 7/17/02, Paper Number: (not listed)		<b>Would be allowable</b> if written in independent form including all limitations of the independent claim. However Examiner missed some claims.
Supplemental Office Action dated 08/23/02 Paper Number: (not listed)		<b>Rejected</b> § 103(a) Yeath Sr. (previously cited) & Arnold.
Response dated 11/25/02		Response with argument (claim not amended)
Office Action dated 01/03/03, Paper Number: (not listed)		<b>Rejected</b> § 103(a) Bower (previously cited) & Arnold (previously cited)
Response dated 03/20/03	48. The vehicle of claim <u>[[47]] 41</u> wherein said front wheel comprises a 360 degree rotatability about an axis substantially orthogonal to the axis of rotation of said front wheel for translational movement of said vehicle.  [Claim 41 reads: A fire-fighting emergency response vehicle, said vehicle comprising: a triangular wheel base comprising a single front wheel and two opposing rear wheels; a driver's seat and drivers compartment; at least one emergency response fluid delivery tank; and a[[n]] vehicle engine.]	Claim amended because substance of claim 47 was incorporated into claim 41.
Office Action dated 04/04/03, Paper Number: 22		<b>Would be allowable</b> if written in independent form including all limitations of the independent claim.

# CLAIM HISTORY (CLAIMS 48 and 60)

Response dated 05/29/03	60. A fire-fighting emergency response vehicle, said vehicle comprising:  a triangular wheel base comprising a single front wheel and two opposing rear wheels wherein said front wheel comprises a 360° rotatability for translational movement of said vehicle;  a driver's seat and driver's compartment; at least one emergency response fluid delivery tank; and  a vehicle engine.	<b>Rewritten</b> as new claim 60, continued with claim 47 and 41 because Examiner indicated it would be allowed.
Office Action dated 10/17/03, Paper Number: (not listed)		<b>Claim 60 Rejected</b> § 103(a) Pestotnik (previously cited) & Carrier (previously cited) & Arnold (previously cited)

# CLAIM HISTORY (CLAIMS 55 and 76)

Claim 55 initially presented in Preliminary Amendment dated 10/17/00	55. The vehicle of claim 41 further comprising left and right brakes wherein said brakes comprise separate controllability.	Original Claim <b>Presented</b>
Office Action dated 7/17/02, Paper Number: (not listed)		Not considered though acknowledged
Supplemental Office Action dated 08/23/02 Paper Number: (not listed)		<b>Rejected</b> § 103(a) Yeath Sr. and Matsushita.
Response dated 11/25/02		Response with argument (claim not amended)
Office Action dated 01/03/03, Paper Number: (not listed)		<b>Rejected</b> § 103(a) relying on Bower and Matsushita.
Response dated 03/20/03		<b>Response with argument (claim not amended)</b>
Office Action dated 04/04/03, Paper Number: 22		<b>Would be allowable</b> if written in independent form including all limitations of the independent claim.
Response dated 05/29/03	76. A fire-fighting emergency response vehicle, said vehicle comprising: a triangular wheel base comprising a single front wheel and two opposing rear wheels; a driver's seat and driver's compartment; at least one emergency response fluid delivery tank; <del>and</del> a vehicle engine; and left and right brakes wherein said brakes comprise separate controllability.	<b>Rewritten</b> as new claim 76
Office Action dated 10/17/03, Paper Number: (not listed)		<b>Claim 76 rejected</b> § 103(a) Pestotnik (previously cited) & Carrier (previously cited) & Matsushita (previously cited).

### CLAIM HISTORY (CLAIMS 56 and 93)

Claim 56 initially presented in Response dated 03/20/03	56. The vehicle of claim 41 further comprising a wedge-shaped front nose.	Original Claim <b>Presented</b>
Office Action dated 04/04/03, Paper Number: 22		<b>Would be allowable</b> if written in independent form including all limitations of the independent claim.
Response dated 05/29/03		<b>Rewritten</b> as new claim 93, continuing claim 56 and 41, because the Examiner indicated it would be allowed.
Office Action dated 10/17/03, Paper Number: (not listed)	93. A fire-fighting emergency response vehicle, said vehicle comprising: a triangular wheel base comprising a single front wheel and two opposing rear wheels; a driver's seat and driver's compartment; at least one emergency response fluid delivery tank; a vehicle engine; <u>and</u> a wedge-shape front nose.	<b>Claim 93 rejected</b> § 103(a) Pestotnik (previously cited) & Carrier (previously cited) & Matsushita (previously cited).

G:\AMDS\Johnson, John Claims History Chart.doc